arXiv:1303.2513v1 [q-fin.PM] 11 Mar 2013

Dynamic Programming Equations for Portfolio Optimization under Partial Information with Expert Opinions

Rüdiger Frey * Ralf Wunderlich†

This paper investigates optimal portfolio strategies in a market where the drift is driven by an unobserved Markov chain. Information on the state of this chain is obtained from stock prices and expert opinions in the form of signals at random discrete time points. As in Frey et al. (2012), Int. J. Theor. Appl. Finance, 15, No. 1, we use stochastic filtering to transform the original problem into an optimization problem under full information where the state variable is the filter for the Markov chain. This problem is studied with dynamic programming techniques and with regularization arguments. Using results from the recent literature we obtain the existence of classical solutions to the dynamic programming equation in a regularized version of the model. From this the optimal strategy in the regularized model is straightforward to compute. We give convergence results which show that this strategy is ε-optimal in the original model.

Keywords: Portfolio optimization, hidden Markov model, dynamic programming equation, regularization, ε-optimal strategy

1. Introduction

It is well-known that optimal investment strategies in dynamic portfolio optimization depend crucially on the drift of the underlying asset price process. On the other hand it is notoriously difficult to estimate drift parameters from historical asset price data. Hence it is natural to include expert opinions or investors' views as additional source of information in the computation of optimal portfolios. In the context of the classical one-period Markowitz model this leads to the well-known Black-Littermann approach, where Bayesian updating is used to improve return predictions (see Black & Litterman (1992)).

Frey et al. (2012) consider expert opinions in the context of a dynamic portfolio optimization problem in continuous time. In their paper the asset price process is modelled as diffusion whose drift is driven by a hidden finite-state Markov chain Y. Investors observe the stock prices and in addition a marked point process with jump-size distribution depending on the current state of Y that represents expert opinions. Frey et al. (2012) derive a finite-dimensional filter p_t for the state of Y and they reduce the portfolio optimization problem to a problem under complete information with state variable given by the filter p_t. Moreover they write down the dynamic programming equation for the value function V of that problem and they give an expression for the optimal strategy in terms of V and its derivatives. The precise mathematical interpretation of the dynamic programming equation is however left open; in particular it is not clear if a classical solution exists and thus if the formula for the optimal strategy is mathematically meaningful.

---

*Institute for Statistics and Mathematics, Vienna University of Economics and Business,
Augasse 2-6, A-1090 Vienna, Austria, e-mail: ruediger.frey@wu.ac.at
†Mathematical Institute, Brandenburg University of Technology Cottbus,
D-03013 Cottbus, Germany, e-mail: ralf.wunderlich@tu-cottbus.de

These issues are addressed in the present paper. The main difficulty in establishing the existence of a classical solution is the fact that the dynamic programming equation is not strictly elliptic if the number of states of Y is larger than the number of assets. In order to overcome this problem we use a regularization argument where an additional noise term of the form $m^{-\frac{1}{2}} d\widetilde{B}_t$, $\widetilde{B}$ an independent Brownian motion of suitable dimension and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ large, is added to the dynamics of the state process p. The dynamic programming equation associated with the regularized optimization problem is strictly elliptical so that a recent results of Davis & Lleo (2011) imply the existence of a classical solution V^m. Moreover, the optimal strategy for the regularized problem exists and is of the same form as the candidate optimal strategy for the original problem (but of course with V^m instead of V). Adapting arguments from Pham (1998) we show that for $m \to \infty$ reward- and value function for the regularized problem and the original problem converge. This implies that for m sufficiently large the optimal strategy for the regularized problem is a nearly-optimal strategy in the original problem so that we have solved the problem of finding good strategies, at least theoretically.

The related literature on portfolio optimization under partial information is discussed in detail in the companion paper Frey et al. (2012). Here we just mention the papers Rieder & Bäuerle (2005) and Sass & Haussmann (2004) that are concerned with portfolio optimization in models with Markov-modulated drift but without any extra information.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the model of the financial market and formulate the portfolio optimization problem. For this problem we derive in Section 3 the dynamic programming equation in the case of power utility. In Section 4 we reformulate the state equation in terms of an exogeneous Poisson random measure. For this reformulated state equation we provide in Section 5 an explicit construction of the jump coefficient. The main results of this paper are presented in Section 6. Here we study a regularized version of the dynamic programming equation and investigate ε-optimal strategies.

2. Model and Optimization Problem

The analytical setting is based on that proposed by Frey et al. (2012). For a fixed date $T > 0$ representing the investment horizon, we work on a filtered probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{G}, \mathbb{G}, P)$, with filtration $\mathbb{G} = (\mathcal{G}_t)_{t \in [0,T]}$ satisfying the usual conditions. All processes are assumed to be $\mathbb{G}$-adapted. For a generic $\mathbb{G}$-adapted process H we denote by $\mathbb{G}^H$ the filtration generated by H.

Price dynamics. We consider a market model for one risk-free bond with price $S_t^0 = 1$ and n risky securities with prices $S_t = (S_t^1, \ldots, S_t^n)^\top$ given by

$$dS_t^i = S_t^i \Big(\mu^i(Y_t) dt + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \sigma^{ij} dW_t^j \Big), \quad S_0^i = s^i, \quad i = 1, \cdots, n. \tag{2.1}$$

Here $\mu = \mu(Y_t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the mean stock return or drift which is driven by some factor process Y described below. The volatility $\sigma = (\sigma^{ij})_{1 \le i,j \le n}$ is assumed to be a constant invertible matrix and $W_t = (W_t^1, \cdots .W_t^n)$ is an n-dimensional $\mathbb{G}$-adapted Brownian motion. The invertibility of σ always can be ensured by a suitable parametrization if the covariance matrix $\sigma\sigma^\top$ is positive definite. The factor process

Y is a finite-state Markov chain independent of the Brownian motion W with state space $\{e_1, \ldots, e_d\}$ where e_i is the ith unit vector in $\mathbb{R}^d$. The generator matrix is denoted by Q and the initial distribution by $\widetilde{p} = (\widetilde{p}^1, \ldots, \widetilde{p}^d)^\top$. The states of the factor process Y are mapped onto the states $\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_d$ of the drift by the function $\mu(Y_t) = MY_t$, where $M_{lk} = \mu_k^l = \mu^l(e_k)$, $1 \leq l \leq n$, $1 \leq k \leq d$.

Define the return process R associated with the price process S by $dR_t^i = dS_t^i / S_t^i$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Note that R satisfies $dR_t = \mu(Y_t)dt + \sigma dW_t$, and it is easily seen that $\mathbb{G}^R = \mathbb{G}^{\log S} = \mathbb{G}^S$. This is useful, since it allows us to work with R instead of S in the filtering part. For details we refer to Frey et al. (2012).

Investor Information. We assume that the investor does not observe the factor process Y directly; he does however know the model parameters, in particular the initial distribution $\widetilde{p}$, the generator matrix Q and the functions $\mu^i(\cdot)$. Moreover, he has noisy observations of the hidden process Y at his disposal. More precisely we assume that the investor observes the return process R and that he receives at discrete points in time T_n noisy signals about the current state of Y. These signals are to be interpreted as expert opinions; specific examples can be found in the companion paper Frey et al. (2012).

We model expert opinions by a marked point process $I = (T_n, Z_n)$, so that at T_n the investor observes the realization of a random variables Z_n whose distribution depends on the current state Y_{T_n} of the factor process. The T_n are modeled as jump times of a standard Poisson process with intensity λ, independent of Y, so that the timing of the information arrival does not carry any useful information. The signal Z_n takes values in some set $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbb{R}^\kappa$, and we assume that given $Y_{T_n} = e_k$, the distribution of Z_n is absolutely continuous with Lebesgue-density $f_k(z)$. We identify the marked point process $I = (T_n, Z_n)$ with the associated counting measure denoted by $I(dt, dz)$. Note that the $\mathbb{G}$-compensator of I is $\lambda dt \sum_{k=1}^d 1_{Y_t = e_k} f_k(z) dz$.

Summarizing, the information available to the investor is given by the *investor filtration* $\mathbb{F}$ with

$$\mathcal{F}_t = \mathcal{G}_t^R \vee \mathcal{G}_t^I, \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{2.2}$$

Portfolio and optimization problem. We describe the selffinancing trading of an investor by the initial capital $x_0 > 0$ and the n-dimensional $\mathbb{F}$-adapted trading strategy h where h_t^i, $i = 1, \ldots, n$, represents the proportion of wealth invested in stock i at time t. It is well-known that in this setting the wealth process $X^{(h)}$ has the dynamics

$$\frac{dX_t^{(h)}}{X_t^{(h)}} = \sum_{i=0}^n h_t^i \frac{dS_t^i}{S_t^i} = h_t^\top \mu(Y_t)dt + h_t^\top \sigma dW_t, \quad X_0^{(h)} = x_0. \tag{2.3}$$

We assume that for all $t \in [0, T]$ the strategy h_t takes values in some convex and compact subset K of $\mathbb{R}^n$. The set K can be used to model constraints on the portfolio; for instance the choice

$$K = \{h \in \mathbb{R}^n \colon h_i \geq c_1 \text{ for some } c_1 < 0, \sum_{i=1}^n h_i \leq c_2 \text{ for some } c_2 \geq 1\}$$

would correspond to a limit $|c_1|$ on the amount of shortselling and a limit c_2 for leverage. Moreover, the assumption that $h_t \in K$ for all t facilitates many technical estimates in the paper. We denote by

$$\mathcal{H} = \{h = (h_t)_{t\in[0,T]} \colon \; h \text{ is } \mathbb{F} \text{ adapted and } h_t \in K \text{ for all } t\} \tag{2.4}$$

the class of *admissible trading strategies*. Since $\mu(Y_t)$ is bounded and σ is constant, equation (2.3) is well defined for all $h \in \mathcal{H}$.

We assume that the investor wants to maximize the expected utility of terminal wealth for power utility $U(x) = \frac{x^\theta}{\theta}$, $\theta < 1,\ \theta \neq 0$.[a] The optimization problem thus reads as

$$\max\{E(U(X_T^{(h)}))\colon h \in \mathcal{H}\}. \tag{2.5}$$

This is a maximization problem under partial information since we have required that the strategy h is adapted to the investor filtration $\mathbb{F}$.

Partial information and filtering Next we explain how the control problem (2.5) can be reduced to a control problem with complete information via filtering arguments. We use the following notation: for a generic process H we denote by $\widehat{H}_t = E(H|\mathcal{F}_t)$ its optional projection on the filtration $\mathbb{F}$, and the filter for the Markov chain Y_t is denoted by $p_t = (p_t^1, \cdots, p_t^d)$ with $p_t^k = P(Y_t = e_k|\mathcal{F}_t),\ k = 1\ldots, d$. Note that for a process of the form $H_t = h(Y_t)$ the optional projection is given by $\widehat{h(Y_t)} = \sum_{k=1}^d h(e_k)p_t^k$. In particular, the projection of of the drift equals

$$\widehat{\mu(Y_t)} = \sum_{k=1}^d \mu(e_k)p_t^k = Mp_t\,.$$

The following two processes will drive the dynamics of p_t. First, let

$$\widetilde{W}_t := \sigma^{-1}(R_t - \int_0^t Mp_s ds).$$

By standard results from filtering theory $\widetilde{W}$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-Brownian motion (the so-called innovations process). Second, define the predictable random measure

$$\nu_I(dt, dz) = \lambda dt \sum_{k=1}^d p_{t-}^k f_k(z)dz.$$

By standard results on point processes ν_I is the $\mathbb{F}$-compensator of I, see for instance Bremaud (1981). The compensated random measure will be denoted by $\widetilde{I}(dt, dz) := I(dt, dz) - \nu_I(dt, dz)$.

Using a combination of the HMM filter (see e.g. Wonham (1965), Elliott et al. (1994), Liptser & Shiryaev (2001)) and Bayesian updating, in Frey et al. (2012) the following d-dimensional SDE system for the dynamics of the filter p is derived

$$dp_t = Q^\top p_t dt + \beta^\top(p_t)d\widetilde{W}_t + \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \gamma_I(p_{t-}, z)\widetilde{I}(dt, dz) \tag{2.6}$$

---

[a] The case $\theta = 0$ corresponds to logarithmic utility $U(x) = \ln x$ which is treated in Frey et al. (2012).

with initial condition $p_0^k = \widetilde{p}^k$. Here, the matrix $\beta = \beta(p) = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_d) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and the vector $\gamma_I = \gamma_I(p, z) = (\gamma_I^1, \dots, \gamma_I^d)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are defined by

$$\beta_k(p) = p^k \Big(\sigma^{-1} \big(\mu_k - \sum_{j=1}^d p^j \mu_j \big) = p^k \sigma^{-1} M(e_k - p) \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

$$\text{and} \quad \gamma_I^k(p, z) = p^k \bigg(\frac{f_k(z)}{\overline{f}(z, p)} - 1 \bigg), \; 1 \le k \le d, \quad \text{with} \quad \overline{f}(z, p) = \sum_{k=1}^d p^k f_k(z). \tag{2.7}$$

It is well-known (see e.g. Lakner (1998), Sass and Haussmann (2004)) that the $\mathbb{F}$-semimartingale decomposition of X is given by

$$\frac{dX_t^{(h)}}{X_t^{(h)}} = h_t^\top M p_t \, dt + h_t^\top \sigma d\widetilde{W}_t. \tag{2.8}$$

Now note that for a constant strategy $h_t \equiv h \in K$ the $(d+1)$-dimensional process $(X^{(h)}, p)$ is an $\mathbb{F}$-Markov process as is immediate from the dynamics in (2.6) and (2.8). Hence the optimization problem (2.5) can be considered as a control problem under complete information with the $(d+1)$-dimensional state variable process $(X^{(h)}, p)$. This control problem is studied in the remainder of the paper.

3. Dynamic Programming Equation for the Case of Power Utility

A simplified optimization problem. As a first step, we simplify the control problem by a change of measure. As shown in Nagai & Runggaldier (2008) this measure change leads to a new problem where the set of state variables is reduced to p and where the dynamic programming equation takes on a simpler form. First we compute for an admissible strategy $h \in \mathcal{H}$ the utility of terminal wealth $U(X_T^{(h)}) = \frac{1}{\theta}(X_T^{(h)})^\theta$. From (2.8) it follows that

$$\frac{1}{\theta}(X_T^{(h)})^\theta = \frac{x_0^\theta}{\theta} \exp\Big\{ \theta \int_0^T \Big(h_s^\top \widehat{\mu(Y_s)} - \frac{1}{2} \left| \sigma^\top h_s \right|^2 \Big) ds + \theta \int_0^T h_s^\top \sigma d\widetilde{W}_s \Big\}, \tag{3.1}$$

where $|.|$ denotes the Euclidean norm. Define now the random variable $L_T^{(h)} = \exp\big\{ \int_0^T \theta h_s^\top \sigma d\widetilde{W}_s - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^T \left| \theta \sigma^\top h_s \right|^2 ds \big\}$ and the function

$$b(p, h; \theta) = -\theta \Big(h^\top M p - \frac{1 - \theta}{2} \left| \sigma^\top h \right|^2 \Big). \tag{3.2}$$

Recall that $\widehat{\mu(Y_s)} = \sum_{k=1}^d \mu_k p_s^k = M p_s$. Hence (3.1) can be written in the form

$$\frac{1}{\theta}(X_T^{(h)})^\theta = \frac{x_0^\theta}{\theta} L_T^{(h)} \exp\Big\{ \int_0^T -b(p_s, h_s; \theta) ds \Big\}. \tag{3.3}$$

Since σ is deterministic and h is bounded, the Novikov condition implies that $E(L_T^{(h)}) = 1$. Hence we can define an equivalent measure P^h on $\mathcal{F}_T$ by $dP^h/dP = L_T^{(h)}$, and Girsanov's theorem guarantees that $B_t := \widetilde{W}_t - \theta \int_0^t \sigma^\top h_s ds$ is a standard $\mathbb{F}$-Brownian motion. Substituting into (2.6) we find the following dynamics for the filter under P^h

$$dp_t = \alpha(p_t, h_t) dt + \beta^\top(p_t) dB_t + \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \gamma_I(p_{t-}, z) \widetilde{I}(dt, dz) \tag{3.4}$$

$$\text{where} \quad \alpha = \alpha(p, h) = Q^\top p + \theta \beta^\top(p) \sigma^\top h. \tag{3.5}$$

In view of these transformations, for $0 < \theta < 1$ the optimization problem (2.5) is equivalent to

$$\max\Big\{E\Big(\exp\Big\{\int_0^T -b(p_s^{(0,\widetilde{p},h)}, h_s;\theta)ds\Big\}\Big)\colon h \in \mathcal{H}\Big\} \tag{3.6}$$

where we denote by $p_s^{(t,p,h)}$ the solution of (3.4) for $s \in [t,T]$ starting at time $t \in [0,T]$ with initial value $p \in \mathcal{S}$ for strategy $h \in \mathcal{H}$. For $\theta < 0$ on the other hand (2.5) is equivalent to minimizing the expectation in (3.6). In the sequel we will concentrate on the case $0 < \theta < 1$; the necessary changes for $\theta < 0$ will be indicated where appropriate. Moreover, θ will be largely removed from the notation. The reward and value function for this control problem are given by

$$\begin{aligned} v(t,p,h) &= E\Big(\exp\Big\{\int_t^T -b(p_s^{(t,p,h)}, h_s)ds\Big\}\Big) \quad \text{for } h \in \mathcal{H}, \\ V(t,p) &= \sup\{v(t,p,h)\colon h \in \mathcal{H}\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Note that $v(T,p,h) = V(T,p) = 1$.

The dynamic programming equation. Next, we derive the form of the dynamic programming equation for $V(t,p)$. We begin with the generator of the *state process* p_t (the solution of the SDE (3.4)) for a constant strategy $h_t \equiv h$. Denote by $\mathcal{S} = \{p \in \mathbb{R}^d : \sum_{i=1}^d p^i = 1, p^i \geq 0, i = 1,\dots,d\}$ the unit simplex in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Standard arguments show that the solution of this SDE is a Markov process whose generator $\mathcal{L}^h$ operates on $g \in \mathcal{C}^2(\mathcal{S})$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^h g(p) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^d \beta_i^\top(p)\beta_j(p) g_{p^i p^j} &+ \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha^i(p,h) g_{p^i} \\ &+ \lambda \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \{g(p + \gamma_I(p,z)) - g(p)\}\overline{f}(z,p)dz. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

By standard arguments the dynamic programming equation associated to this optimization problem is

$$V_t(t,p) + \sup_{h\in K}\Big\{\mathcal{L}^h V(t,p) - b(p,h;\theta)V(t,p)\Big\} = 0, \quad (t,p) \in [0,T) \times \mathcal{S}, \tag{3.9}$$

with terminal condition $V(T,p) = 1$. In case that $\theta < 0$ the equation is similar, but the sup is replaced by an inf. Plugging in $\mathcal{L}^h$ as given in (3.8) and $b(p,h)$ as given in (3.2) into (3.9) the dynamic programming equation can be written more explicitly as

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = V_t(t,p) &+ \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k,l=1}^d \beta_k^\top(p_t)\beta_l(p_t)V_{p^k p^l}(t,p) + \sum_{k=1}^d \Big\{\sum_{l=1}^d Q^{lk}p^l\Big\}V_{p^k}(t,p) \\ &+ \lambda \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \{V(t, p + \gamma_I(p,z)) - V(t,p)\}\overline{f}(z,p)dz \\ &+ \sup_{h\in K}\Big\{\sum_{k=1}^d \beta_k^\top(p_t)\sigma^\top \theta h V_{p^k}(t,p) + \theta V(t,p)\Big(h^\top M p - \frac{1}{2}\left|\sigma^\top h\right|^2(1-\theta)\Big)\Big\}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

Suppose for the moment that a classical solution to (3.10) exists. In that case the optimal strategy is easily computed. The argument of the supremum in the last line of (3.10) is quadratic in h and strictly concave (as $\sigma\sigma^\top$ is positive definite). Hence this function attains a unique maximum on the convex set K. If K is sufficiently large this maximum is attained at the solution h^* of the following linear equation (the first-order condition for the unconstrained problem)

$$\sigma \sum_{k=1}^{d} \beta_k(p) V_{p^k}(t,p) + V(t,p)\Big(Mp - \sigma\sigma^\top h(1-\theta)\Big) = 0.$$

Since σ is an invertible matrix h^* is given by

$$h^* = h^*(t,p) = \frac{1}{(1-\theta)}(\sigma\sigma^\top)^{-1}\Big\{Mp + \frac{1}{V(t,p)}\sigma \sum_{k=1}^{d} \beta_k(p) V_{p^k}(t,p)\Big\}. \tag{3.11}$$

So far, our derivation of the HJB equation and of the candidate optimal strategy h^* in (3.11) is purely heuristic. A possible approach to give a precise mathematical meaning to the equation is to use *verification arguments*: if we can find a classical solution $V \in \mathcal{C}^{1,2}([0,T) \times \mathcal{S})$ of equation (3.10) with bounded derivatives, the function h^* introduced in (3.11) is bounded. Hence there exists a solution p^* of the SDE (3.4) with $h_t = h^*(t, p_t^*)$. Then a standard verification result such as Theorem 3.1 of Fleming & Soner (2006) immediately gives that V is the value function of the control problem (3.6) and that $h_t^* := h^*(t, p_t^*)$ is the optimal strategy.

However, the existence of a classical solution of equation (3.10) is an open issue. The main problem is the fact that one cannot guarantee that the equation is *uniformly elliptic*. To see this note that the coefficient matrix of the second derivatives in (3.10) is given by $C(p) = \beta^\top(p)\beta(p)$. By definition equation (3.10) is uniformly elliptic if the matrix $C(p)$ is strictly positive definite uniformly in p. A necessary condition for this is that there are no non-trivial solutions of the linear equation $\beta x = 0$ so that we need to have the inequality $n \geq d$ (at least as many assets as states of the Markov chain Y). Such an assumption is hard to justify economically; imposing it nonetheless out of mathematical necessity would severely limit the applicability of our approach.

In the present paper we therefore study an alternative route to justifying equations (3.10) and (3.11). In Section 6 we use regularization arguments to show that (3.11) can be used to compute an approximately optimal strategy. More precisely, we add a term $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} d\widetilde{B}_t$, with $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\widetilde{B}$ a Brownian motion of suitable dimension and independent of B, to the dynamics of the state equation (3.4). The HJB equation associated with these regularized dynamics has an additional term $\frac{1}{2m}\Delta V$, Δ the Laplace operator, and is therefore uniformly elliptic.

Hence the results of Davis & Lleo (2011) apply directly to the modified equation, yielding the existence of a classical solution V^m. Moreover, the optimal strategy ${}^m h^*$ of the regularized problem is given by (3.11) with V^m instead of V. We then derive convergence results for the reward- and the value function of the regularized problem as $m \to \infty$. In particular, we show in Theorem 6.5 that for m sufficiently large ${}^m h^*$ is approximately optimal in the original problem.

An alternative justification for the dynamic programming equation (3.10) can be given using the theory of viscosity solutions: using our estimates in Section 5 and results from Pham (1998) it is possible to show that V is a *viscosity solution* of (3.10). Note however, that this approach does not immediately provide a recipe for the computation of a (nearly) optimal strategy.

4. Reformulation of the State Equation

To carry out the program described above we have to reformulate the state equation for a number of reasons. First, in our model the state variable p takes values in the simplex $\mathcal{S}$ which is a subset of a $d-1$-dimensional hyperplane of $\mathbb{R}^d$. If we introduce the announced regularization to the diffusion part of the state equation then the state variable will leave this hyperplane and takes values in the whole $\mathbb{R}^d$ so that the normalization property of p is violated which creates technical difficulties. Second, in our analysis we need to apply results from the literature on the theory of dynamic programming of controlled jump diffusions, such as Pham (1998) and Davis & Lleo (2011). These papers consider models where the jump part of the state variable is driven by an exogenous Poisson random measure. In our model, on the other hand, the measure $\widetilde{I}$ is not an exogenous Poisson random measure since the law of the compensator ν_I depends on the solution p_t.

Restriction to a $d-1$-dimensional state. We rewrite the state equation in terms of the 'restricted' $(d-1)$-dimensional process $\pi = (\pi^1, \dots, \pi^{d-1})^\top = (p^1, \dots, p^{d-1})^\top$. Then the original state p can be recovered from π by using the normalization property for the last component p^d and we define $p = R\pi := \left(\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{d-1}, 1 - \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \pi^i\right)^\top$. Assuming $p \in \mathcal{S}$ implies that the restricted state process takes values in

$$\underline{\mathcal{S}} = \Big\{\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} : \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \pi^i \le 1, \pi^i \ge 0,\ i = 1, \dots, d-1\Big\}.$$

Now the state equation for $\pi \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}$ associated to (3.4) reads as

$$d\pi_t = \underline{\alpha}(\pi_t, h_t)dt + \underline{\beta}^\top(\pi_t)dB_t + \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \underline{\gamma}^I(\pi_{t-}, z)\widetilde{I}(dt, dz) \tag{4.1}$$

where the coefficients are given by

$$\underline{\alpha}(\pi, h) = (\alpha^1(R\pi, h), \dots, \alpha^{d-1}(R\pi, h))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} \tag{4.2}$$

$$\underline{\beta}(\pi) = (\beta_1(R\pi), \dots, \beta_{d-1}(R\pi)) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d-1} \tag{4.3}$$

$$\underline{\gamma}_I(\pi, z) = (\gamma_I^1(R\pi, z), \dots, \gamma_I^{d-1}(R\pi, z))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}. \tag{4.4}$$

It is straightforward to give an explicit expression for $\underline{\alpha}$, $\underline{\beta}$ and $\underline{\gamma}_I$, but such an expression is not needed in the sequel. The original state can be recovered from π by setting $p = R\pi$.

Exogenous Poisson random measure. In the remainder of the paper we assume that the state process solves the following SDE

$$d\pi_t = \underline{\alpha}(\pi_t, h_t)dt + \underline{\beta}^\top(\pi_t)dB_t + \int_{\mathcal{U}} \underline{\gamma}(\pi_{t-}, u)\widetilde{N}(dt, du), \tag{4.5}$$

where $\underline{\alpha}$ and $\underline{\beta}$ are defined above, $\underline{\gamma} : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{U} \to \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, and $\widetilde{N}$ is the compensated measure to some finite activity Poisson random measure N with jumps in a set $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^\kappa$. The compensator of N is denoted by $\nu(du)\lambda dt$, i.e. we have $\widetilde{N}(dt, du) = N(dt, du) - \nu(dz)\lambda dt$. In the next section we show that for a proper choice of $\underline{\gamma}(\cdot)$ and $\widetilde{N}(dt, du)$ the solution of (4.5) has a same law as the original state process from (4.1).

In order to ensure that SDE (4.5) has for each control $h \in \mathcal{H}$ a unique strong solution and for the proof of some of the estimates in Section 6 the coefficients $\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta}$ and $\underline{\gamma}$ have to satisfy certain Lipschitz and growth conditions (see Jacod & Shiryaev (2003) and Pham (1998)). These conditions are given below. For technical reasons we require that the conditions hold not only for $\pi \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}$ but also for a slightly larger set $\underline{\mathcal{S}}_\varepsilon \supset \underline{\mathcal{S}}$ defined for sufficiently small $\varepsilon \geq 0$ by

$$\underline{\mathcal{S}}_\varepsilon := \{\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1} : \operatorname{dist}(\pi, \underline{\mathcal{S}}) \leq \varepsilon\},$$

where we denoted the distance of $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ to $\underline{\mathcal{S}}$ by $\operatorname{dist}(\pi, \underline{\mathcal{S}}) := \inf\{|\pi - \pi_0|_\infty \colon \pi_0 \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}\}$, for $|\pi|_\infty$ the maximum norm on $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$.

Assumption 4.1 (Lipschitz and growth conditions). *There exist constants $C_L, \overline{\varepsilon} > 0$ and a function $\rho : \mathcal{U} \to \mathbb{R}_+$ with $\int_{\mathcal{U}} \rho^2(u)\nu(du) < +\infty$ such that for all $\pi_1, \pi_2 \in \mathcal{S}_\varepsilon$, $\varepsilon < \overline{\varepsilon}$ and $k = 1, \ldots, d$*

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{h \in K} |\underline{\alpha}(\pi_1, h) - \underline{\alpha}(\pi_2, h)| + \left|\underline{\beta}_k(\pi_1) - \underline{\beta}_k(\pi_2)\right| &\leq C_L\, |\pi_1 - \pi_2|\,, &(4.6)\\ |\underline{\alpha}(\pi, h)| + \left|\underline{\beta}_k(\pi)\right| &\leq C_L(1 + |\pi|), &(4.7)\\ \left|\underline{\gamma}(\pi_1, u) - \underline{\gamma}(\pi_2, u)\right| &\leq \rho(u)\, |\pi_1 - \pi_2|\,, &(4.8)\\ \left|\underline{\gamma}(\pi, u)\right| &\leq \rho(u)(1 + |\pi|). &(4.9) \end{aligned}$$

In our case the coefficients $\underline{\alpha}$ and $\underline{\beta}$ are continuously differentiable functions of π on the compact set $\underline{\mathcal{S}}_\varepsilon$ and $h \in K$ is bounded. Hence, the Lipschitz and growth condition (4.6) and (4.7) are fulfilled. Specific conditions on the densities $f_k(\cdot)$ that guarantee (4.8) and (4.9) are given in the next section.

5. State Equation with Exogeneous Poisson Random Measure

In this section we show how a solution of the state equation (4.1) can be constructed by means of an SDE of the form (4.5) that is driven by an exogenous Poisson random measure. The main tool for constructing $\underline{\gamma}$ will be the so-called inverse Rosenblatt or distributional transform, see Rüschendorf (2009), which is an extension of the quantile transformation to the multivariate case.

We impose the following regularity conditions on the functions $f_k(\cdot)$ that represent the conditional densities of Z_n given $Y_{T_n} = e_k$.

Assumption 5.1. *All densities $f_k(z)$, $1 \leq k \leq d$, are continuously differentiable. and have the common support $\mathcal{Z}$. We assume that $\mathcal{Z}$ is a κ-dimensional rectangle $[a, b] \subset \mathbb{R}^\kappa$, i.e.*

$$\mathcal{Z} = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^\kappa : -\infty < a_k \leq z_k \leq b_k < \infty,\ k = 1, \ldots, \kappa\}.$$

Moreover, there is some $0 < C_1$ such that $f_k(z) > C_1$ for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}, k = 1, \ldots, d$

Remark 5.2. Examples for densities that satisfy the above assumption are easily constructed. Start with C^1-densities $\widetilde{f}_k$ and choose some (large) rectangle $\mathcal{Z}$ then

$$f_k(z) = (1 - \varepsilon)\frac{\widetilde{f}_k(z)}{\int_{\mathcal{Z}} \widetilde{f}_k(u)du} 1_{\mathcal{Z}}(z) + \varepsilon \frac{1}{|\mathcal{Z}|} 1_{\mathcal{Z}}(z) \quad \text{where} \quad |\mathcal{Z}| = \prod_{i=1}^{\kappa}(b_i - a_i) \qquad (5.1)$$

$k = 1, \ldots, \kappa$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 1]$, satisfy the requirements of Assumption 5.1. Intuitively, (5.1) corresponds to a mixture of the original density $\widetilde{f}_k$ and the uniform distribution.

The latter distribution carries no information so there is uniform a lower bound on the information carried by a single expert opinion.

In order to write our state equation (4.1) in the form (4.5) with exogenous Poisson random measure we apply the inverse Rosenblatt transform, see for instance see Rüschendorf (2009). Denote by $\mathcal{U} = [0,1]^\kappa$ the unit cube in $\mathbb{R}^\kappa$. In our context the inverse Rosenblatt transform is a mapping $G : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{Z}$ such that for a uniform random variable U on $[0,1]^\kappa$ the random variable $Z = G(U)$ has density $\overline{f}(z,p) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} p^j f_j(z),\ p = R\pi$; the mapping G can thus be viewed as a generalization of the well-known quantile transform.

Now we explain the construction of the transformation G in detail. First, we define for $k = 1, \ldots, \kappa - 1$, $p = R\pi$, the marginal densities

$$f_{Z_1 \ldots Z_k}(z_1, \ldots, z_k, p) = \int_{a_{k+1}}^{b_{k+1}} \cdots \int_{a_\kappa}^{b_\kappa} \overline{f}(z_1, \ldots, z_k, s_{k+1}, \ldots, s_\kappa, p) ds_\kappa \ldots ds_{k+1}, \quad (5.2)$$

For $k = \kappa$ we set $f_{Z_1 \ldots Z_\kappa} := \overline{f}$. Next we define for $k = 2, \ldots, \kappa$ the conditional densities

$$f_{Z_k | Z_1 \ldots Z_{k-1}}(z_k | z_1, \ldots z_{k-1}, p) := \frac{f_{Z_1 \ldots Z_k}(z_1, \ldots, z_k, p)}{f_{Z_1 \ldots Z_{k-1}}(z_1, \ldots, z_{k-1}, p)}$$

and the associated distribution functions

$$F_{Z_k | Z_1 \ldots Z_{k-1}}(z_k | z_1, \ldots z_{k-1}, p) = \int_{a_k}^{z_k} f_{Z_k | Z_1 \ldots Z_{k-1}}(s_k | z_1, \ldots z_{k-1}, p) ds_k;$$

for $k = 1$ we denote by F_{Z_1} the distribution function of Z_1. Now we introduce the Rosenblatt transform $\widetilde{F} : \mathcal{Z} \to [0,1]^\kappa = \mathcal{U}$ by

$$\begin{aligned} &\widetilde{F}(z,p) = \widetilde{F}(z_1, \ldots, z_\kappa, p) = (\widetilde{F}_1(z,p), \ldots, \widetilde{F}_\kappa(z,p))^\top \quad \text{where} && (5.3) \\ &\widetilde{F}_1(z,p) = F_{Z_1}(z_1,p) \text{ and } \widetilde{F}_k(z,p) = F_{Z_k | Z_1 \ldots Z_{k-1}}(z_k | z_1, \ldots z_{k-1}, p),\ k = 2, \ldots, \kappa. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\widetilde{F}_k(z,p)$ depends on the first k variables $z_1, \ldots, z_k$, only. Put for $z_1, \ldots, z_{k-1}$ fixed

$$H_k(z) = \widetilde{F}_k(z_1, \ldots, z_{k-1}, z, p) = F_{Z_k | Z_1 \ldots Z_{k-1}}(z | z_1, \ldots z_{k-1}, p)\,.$$

Then H_k is a cumulative distribution function. Assumption 5.1 ensures that the joint density $\overline{f}(z.p)$ is finite and bounded away from zero. Hence, the conditional densities $f_{Z_k | Z_1 \ldots Z_{k-1}}(z | z_1, \ldots z_{k-1}, p)$ are strictly positive, H_k is strictly increasing and there exist an inverse function $H_k^{-1} : [0,1] \to \mathbb{R}$.

Now the desired transformation $Z = G(U) = G(U,p)$ with the transformation function $G : \mathcal{U} \to \mathcal{Z}$ can be defined recursively by $G(u) = G(u,p) = (G_1(u,p), \ldots, G_\kappa(u,p))^\top$ with

$$\begin{aligned} G_1(u,p) &= H_1^{-1}(u_1) = F_{Z_1}^{-1}(u_1,p) =: z_1 \\ G_k(u,p) &= H_k^{-1}(u_k) = F_{Z_k | Z_1 \ldots Z_{k-1}}^{-1}(u_k | z_1, \ldots z_{k-1}, p) =: z_k,\ k = 2, \ldots, \kappa. \quad (5.4) \end{aligned}$$

Note, that by construction it holds $G(\widetilde{F}(z,p),p) = z$. From Rüschendorf (2009) it is known that for U is uniformly distributed in $[0,1]^\kappa$, the random vector $Z = (Z_1, \ldots, Z_\kappa)^\top = G(U,p)$ has the joint distribution density $\overline{f}(z,p)$.

With the transformation G at hand we define the jump coefficient $\underline{\gamma}(\pi,u)$ by

$$\underline{\gamma}^k(\pi,u) = \pi^k \Big(\frac{f_k(G(u,R\pi))}{\overline{f}(G(u,R\pi),R\pi)} - 1 \Big) \quad \text{for } u \in \mathcal{U}, \quad k = 1, \ldots, d. \qquad (5.5)$$

Moreover, we choose the Poisson random measure $N(dt, du)$ in (4.5) such that the associated compound Poisson process has constant intensity λ and jump heights which are uniformly distributed on $\mathcal{U} = [0, 1]^\kappa$. Then, the compensator of N is $\nu(du)dt = \lambda du\, dt$ and the compensated measure reads as $\widetilde{N}(dt, du) = N(dt, du) - \lambda du\, dt$. Note that with this definition the solution π_t of (4.5) satisfies for some Borel set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$

$$\begin{aligned} P(\Delta\pi_{T_n} \in A \mid \mathcal{F}_{T_n-}) &= \int_{\mathcal{U}} 1_A\big(\underline{\gamma}(\pi_{T_n-}, u)\big)du \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{U}} 1_A\Big(\gamma_I\big(R\pi_{T_n-}, G(u, R\pi_{T_n-})\big)\Big)du \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Z}} 1_A\big(\gamma_I(R\pi_{T_n-}, z))\big)\overline{f}(z, R\pi_{T_n-})dz\,. \end{aligned}$$

Hence with the above choice of γ and $N(dt, du)$, for constant h the process $R\pi$, π the solution of the SDE (4.5), solves the martingale problem associated to the generator $\mathcal{L}^h$ from (3.8). Below we show that under Assumption 5.1 the Lipschitz and growth conditions from Assumption 4.1 hold, so that the SDE (4.5) has a unique solution. It is well-known that this implies that the martingale problem associated with $\mathcal{L}^h$ has a unique solution, see for instance Jacod & Shiryaev (2003), Theorem III.2.26. Hence $R\pi$ has the same law as the state variable process p in (3.4), which shows that we have achieved the desired reformulation of the dynamics of the problem in terms of an exogenous Poisson random measure.

Verification of the Lipschitz and growth conditions. Next we show that under Assumption 5.1 the functions $\underline{\gamma}^k(\pi, u)$ satisfy the Lipschitz and growth conditions (4.8) and (4.9). First note that the fact that all densities are $\mathcal{C}^1$ with compact support $\mathcal{Z} = [a, b]$ implies the existence of constants $C_2, C_d < \infty$ such that for all $1 \le k \le d$, $z \in \mathcal{Z}$,

$$f_k(z) \le C_2 \text{ and } \Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial z_i} f_j(z)\Big| \le C_d, \quad i = 1, \ldots, \kappa. \tag{5.6}$$

Lemma 5.3. *Under Assumption 5.1 and for* $\varepsilon \le \overline{\varepsilon} := \frac{C_1}{(d-1)C_2}$ *the coefficient* $\underline{\gamma}(\pi, u)$ *defined in* (5.5) *satisfies for* $\pi \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}_\varepsilon$ *the Lipschitz and growth condition* (4.8) *and* (4.9)*.*

Proof. We give the proof for the maximum norm $|.|_\infty$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$. From this the assertion for the Euclidean norm can be deduced from the equivalence of norms.

First we show that for $\pi \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}_\varepsilon$, $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $\varepsilon < \overline{\varepsilon}$ there are constants $0 < C_* \le C^* < \infty$ such that

$$C_* \le \overline{f}(z, R\pi) \le C^*. \tag{5.7}$$

For this, observe that for $p = R\pi$,

$$\overline{f}(z, p) = \sum_{j=1}^{d} p^j f_j(z) = \sum_{p^j < 0} p^j f_j(z) + \sum_{p^j \ge 0} p^j f_j(z). \tag{5.8}$$

For the lower bound we deduce

$$\begin{aligned}\overline{f}(z,p) &\geq \sum_{p^j<0}(-\varepsilon)\max_j f_j(z) + \sum_{p^j\geq 0} p^j \min_j f_j(z)\\ &\geq -\varepsilon(d-1)C_2 \quad + \quad \Big(1-\sum_{p^j<0}p^j\Big)\cdot C_1 \geq -\varepsilon\frac{C_1}{\overline{\varepsilon}} + 1\cdot C_1 = C_*,\end{aligned}$$

where we used (5.6), $p^j \geq -\varepsilon$ and $\sum_{j=1}^d p^j = 1$. For the upper bound from 5.8 we find

$$\overline{f}(z,p) \leq 0 + \sum_{p^j\geq 0} p^j \max_j f_j(z) \leq \Big(1-\sum_{p^j<0}p^j\Big)C_2 \leq (1+\varepsilon(d-1))C_2 = C^*$$

Note that the lower bound in (5.7) implies that $\overline{f}(\cdot, R\pi)$ is strictly positive for $\pi \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}_\varepsilon$. Moreover, since the components of $p = R\pi$ sum up to one by definition $\overline{f}(\cdot, R\pi)$ is a strictly positive probability density for $\pi \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}_\varepsilon$. Hence, the inverse Rosenblatt transform $G(u, R\pi)$ and thus the function $\underline{\gamma}(\pi, u)$ defined in (5.5) is well defined for $\pi \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}_\varepsilon$ (and not just for $\pi \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}$).

Next we turn to the Lipschitz condition (4.8). Clearly, (4.8) holds for some constant function $\rho(u) = \overline{\rho}$ if we can show that the derivatives of $\gamma(\pi, u)$ with respect to π^j are bounded for all $1 \leq j \leq d-1$. This is obviously equivalent to estimating the derivatives of

$$\gamma^k(p,u) = p^k\Big(\frac{f_k(G(u,p))}{\overline{f}(G(u,p),p)} - 1\Big)$$

with respect to the components p^j. Let

$$c_j^k(p,u) := \frac{\partial}{\partial p^j}\Big(\frac{f_k(G(u,p))}{\overline{f}(G(u,p),p)} - 1\Big), \quad j,k = 1,\ldots,d.$$

Then it holds

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p^j}\gamma^k(p,u) = \delta_{jk}\Big(\frac{f_k(G(u,p))}{\overline{f}(G(u,p),p)} - 1\Big) + p^k c_j^k(p,u).$$

The first term on the r.h.s. is bounded since it holds for $k = 1,\ldots,d$ and $\varepsilon < \overline{\varepsilon}$

$$\frac{f_k(G(u,p))}{\overline{f}(G(u,p),p)} \leq \frac{C_2}{C_*}, \tag{5.9}$$

where we have used (5.6) and the lower bound for $\overline{f}(z,p)$ given in (5.7).

It remains to show that $c_j^k(p,u)$ is bounded. Abbreviating $z = z(p) = G(u,p)$ we find

$$\begin{aligned}c_j^k(p,u) = \frac{1}{(\overline{f}(z,p))^2}\Big(&\sum_{l=1}^{\kappa}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_l}f_k(z)\frac{\partial}{\partial p^j}G_l(u,p)\cdot\overline{f}(z,p)\\ &-f_k(z)\cdot\Big(f_j(z) + \sum_{i=1}^d p^i\sum_{l=1}^{\kappa}\frac{\partial}{\partial z_l}f_i(z)\frac{\partial}{\partial p^j}G_l(u,p)\Big)\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

Using (5.6), $\sum_{j=1}^d |p^j| \leq 1 + (d-1)\overline{\varepsilon}$ and estimate (5.7) for $\overline{f}$, we derive for $\varepsilon < \overline{\varepsilon}$

$$\begin{aligned}|c_j^k(p,u)| \leq \frac{1}{C_*^2}\Big(&C_d\sum_{l=1}^{\kappa}\Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial p^j}G_l(u,p)\Big|C^*\\ &+C_2\cdot\Big(C_2 + (1+(d-1)\overline{\varepsilon})C_d\sum_{l=1}^{\kappa}\Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial p^j}G_l(u,p)\Big|\Big)\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

From the above inequality the boundedness of c_j^k can be deduced from the boundedness of the derivatives $\frac{\partial}{\partial p^j} G_l(u,p)$. This is the assertion of the following lemma which is proven in the Appendix.

Lemma 5.4. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 5.3 there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for $j = 1, \dots, d$ and $l = 1, \dots, \kappa$*

$$\Big| \frac{\partial}{\partial p^j} G_l(u,p) \Big| \leq C.$$

Proof of the growth condition (4.9)**:** Here we apply estimate (5.9) and find

$$|\gamma^j(p,u)| = \Big| p^j \Big(\frac{f_j(G(u,p))}{\overline{f}(G(u,p),p)} - 1 \Big) \Big| \leq |p^j| \Big(\frac{C_2}{C_*} + 1 \Big) \leq (1 + |p|_\infty) \Big(\frac{C_2}{C_*} + 1 \Big)$$

and hence $|\gamma(p,u)|_\infty \leq \overline{\rho}(1 + |p|_\infty)$ with some constant $\overline{\rho}$. □

6. Regularized Dynamic Programming Equation

In this section we introduce the regularized version of our dynamic programming problem and we discuss the convergence of reward and value function as the regularization-terms converge to zero. In Corollary 6.5 we finally show that optimal strategies in the regularized problem are nearly optimal in the original problem.

Regularized state equation. Since regularization will drive the state process outside the set $\underline{\mathcal{S}}$ we need to extend the definition of the coefficients $\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta}$ and $\underline{\gamma}$ from $\underline{\mathcal{S}}$ to the whole $\mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. For $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$, $h \in K$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ we define

$$\widetilde{\underline{\alpha}}(\pi, h) := \begin{cases} \underline{\alpha}(\pi,h)(1 - \operatorname{dist}(\pi, \underline{\mathcal{S}})/\varepsilon) & \text{for} \quad \pi \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}_\varepsilon \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Note, that $\underline{\mathcal{S}} \subset \underline{\mathcal{S}}_\varepsilon$ and there is a continuous transition to zero if $\operatorname{dist}(\pi, \underline{\mathcal{S}})$ reaches ε. Moreover, on $\underline{\mathcal{S}}$ it holds $\widetilde{\underline{\alpha}}(\pi,h) = \underline{\alpha}(\pi,h)$, i.e. the coefficients coincide. Analogously we define $\widetilde{\underline{\beta}}$ and $\widetilde{\underline{\gamma}}$ as extensions of $\underline{\beta}$ and $\underline{\gamma}$.

Lemma 6.1. *Under the assumptions of Lemma 4.1 the coefficients $\widetilde{\underline{\alpha}}, \widetilde{\underline{\beta}}$ and $\widetilde{\underline{\gamma}}$ satisfy the Lipschitz and growth conditions* (4.6) *to* (4.9) *for $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$.*

Proof. The Lipschitz and growth conditions for the coefficients $\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta}$ and $\underline{\gamma}$ given in Lemma 4.1 hold for $\pi \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}_\varepsilon$ for $\varepsilon \leq \overline{\varepsilon}$. Multiplication of these functions by the bounded and Lipschitz continuous function $1 - \operatorname{dist}(\pi, \underline{\mathcal{S}})/\varepsilon$ preserves the Lipschitz and growth property. □

For the sake of simplicity of notation in the sequel we will suppress the tilde and simply write $\underline{\alpha}, \underline{\beta}$ and $\underline{\gamma}$ instead of $\widetilde{\underline{\alpha}}, \widetilde{\underline{\beta}}$ and $\widetilde{\underline{\gamma}}$.

Next we define the dynamics of the regularized state process ${}^m\pi_t$

$$d\,{}^m\pi_t = \underline{\alpha}({}^m\pi_t, h_t)dt + \underline{\beta}^\top({}^m\pi_t)dB_t + \int_{\mathcal{Z}} \underline{\gamma}({}^m\pi_{t-}, u)\widetilde{N}(dt,du) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} d\widetilde{B}_t \qquad (6.1)$$

where $\widetilde{B}_t$ denotes a $d-1$-dimensional Brownian motion independent of B_t. This state process is now driven by an $n + d - 1$-dimensional Brownion motion. Note that the diffusion coefficient of the regularized equation $(\underline{\beta}^\top(\pi_t), \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} I_{d-1})^\top$ satisfies the Lipschitz and growth condition (4.6) and (4.7) given in Lemma 4.1 since $\underline{\beta}(\pi_t)$ satisfies these conditions and $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} I_{d-1}$ does not depend on p.

L_2-Convergence ${}^m\pi_t \to \pi_t$. We now compare the solution ${}^m\pi_t$ of the regularized state equation (6.1) with the solution π_t of the unregularized state equation (4.5) and study asymptotic properties for $m \to \infty$. This will be crucial for establishing convergence of the associated reward function of the regularized problem to the original optimization problem.

We assume that both processes start at time $t_0 \in [0, T]$ with the same initial value $q \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}$, i.e. ${}^m\pi_{t_0} = \pi_{t_0} = q$. The corresponding solutions are denoted by ${}^m\pi_t^{(t_0,q,h)}$ and ${}^m\pi_t^{(t_0,q,h)}$.

Lemma 6.2 (Uniform L_2-convergence w.r.t. $h \in \mathcal{H}$). *It holds for $m \to \infty$*

$$E\Big(\sup_{t_0 \le t \le T} \Big| {}^m\pi_t^{(t_0,q,h)} - \pi_t^{(t_0,q,h)} \Big|^2 \Big) \longrightarrow 0 \quad \textit{uniformly for } h \in \mathcal{H}.$$

Proof. To simplify the notation we suppress the superscript (t_0, q, h) and write π_t and ${}^m\pi_t$. Moreover, we denote by C a generic constant.

We give the proof for $t_0 = 0$, only. Using the corresponding representation as stochastic integrals for the solutions of the above SDEs we find

$$\begin{aligned} {}^m\pi_t - \pi_t \;&=\; A_t^m + M_t^m \\ \text{where} \quad A_t^m \;&:=\; \int_0^t (\underline{\alpha}({}^m\pi_s, h_s) - \underline{\alpha}(\pi_s, h_s))ds \quad \text{and} \\ M_t^m \;&=\; \int_0^t (\underline{\beta}({}^m\pi_s) - \underline{\beta}(\pi_s))^\top dB_s + \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{U}} (\underline{\gamma}({}^m\pi_s, u) - \underline{\gamma}(\pi_s, u))\widetilde{N}(ds, du) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}\, d\widetilde{B}_t. \end{aligned}$$

Denoting $G_t^m := E\Big(\sup_{s \le t} |{}^m\pi_s - \pi_s|^2\Big)$ it holds

$$G_t^m = E\Big(\sup_{s \le t} |A_s^m + M_s^m|^2 \Big) \le 2E\Big(\sup_{s \le t} |A_s^m|^2 \Big) + 2E\Big(\sup_{s \le t} |M_s^m|^2 \Big). \tag{6.2}$$

For the first term on the r.h.s. we find by applying Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and the Lipschitz condition (4.6) for α

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{s \le t} |A_s^m|^2 &= \sup_{s \le t} \Big| \int_0^s \big(\underline{\alpha}({}^m\pi_u, h_u) - \underline{\alpha}(\pi_u, h_u) \big) du \Big|^2 \\ &\le \sup_{s \le t}\; s \cdot \int_0^s \Big| \underline{\alpha}({}^m\pi_u, h_u) - \underline{\alpha}(\pi_u, h_u)) \Big|^2 du \\ &\le t \cdot \int_0^t C_L |{}^m\pi_u - \pi_u|^2 du \le t \cdot \int_0^t C_L \sup_{v \le u} |{}^m\pi_v - \pi_v|^2 du. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the constant C_L does not depend on h. Taking expectation it follows

$$E\Big(\sup_{s \le t} |A_s^m|^2 \Big) \le t \cdot C_L \int_0^t E\Big(\sup_{v \le s} |{}^m\pi_v - \pi_v|^2 ds \Big) \le C \int_0^t G_s^m ds. \tag{6.3}$$

For the second term on the r.h.s. of (6.2) Doob's inequality for martingales yields

$$\begin{aligned} E\Big(\sup_{s \le t} |M_s^m|^2 \Big) \le 4E(|M_t^m|^2) = 4\Big(&\int_0^t E\big(\operatorname{tr}[(\underline{\beta}({}^m\pi_s) - \underline{\beta}(\pi_s))^\top (\underline{\beta}({}^m\pi_s) - \underline{\beta}(\pi_s))] \big) ds \\ &+ \int_0^t \int_{\mathcal{U}} E\big(\big| \underline{\gamma}({}^m\pi_s, u) - \underline{\gamma}(\pi_s, u)) \big|^2 \big) \nu(du) ds + \frac{(d-1)t}{m} \Big). \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

Using the Lipschitz conditions (4.6) and (4.8) for the coefficients β and γ it follows

$$\begin{aligned}
E\big(tr[(\underline{\beta}({}^m\pi_s) - \underline{\beta}(\pi_s))^\top(\underline{\beta}({}^m\pi_s) - \underline{\beta}(\pi_s))]\big) &\le C_L^2 E(|{}^m\pi_s - \pi_s|^2)\\
&\le C_L^2 E\big(\sup_{v\le s}|{}^m\pi_v - \pi_v|^2\big) = C_L^2 G_s^m\\
E\big(\,|\underline{\gamma}({}^m\pi_s,u) - \underline{\gamma}(\pi_s,u))|^2\,\big) &\le \rho^2(u)E(|{}^m\pi_s - \pi_s|^2)\\
&\le \rho^2(u)E\big(\sup_{v\le s}|{}^m\pi_v - \pi_v|^2\big) = \rho^2(u)G_s^m.
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above estimates into (6.4) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
E\Big(\sup_{s\le t}|M_s^m|^2\Big) &\le 4\Big(\int_0^t C_L^2 G_s^m ds + \int_0^t G_s^m ds\int_{\mathcal{U}}\rho^2(u)\nu(du) + \frac{(d-1)t}{m}\Big)\\
&\le C\int_0^t G_s^m ds + \frac{4(d-1)t}{m}. \qquad (6.5)
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting (6.3) and (6.5) into (6.2) we find

$$G_t^m \le \frac{4(d-1)T}{m} + C\int_0^t G_s^m ds.$$

Finally we apply Gronwall Lemma to derive

$$G_T^m \le \frac{4(d-1)T}{m}\, e^{CT} \to 0 \quad \text{for } m\to\infty$$

which concludes the proof. □

Note, that the L_2-convergence for the restricted state process ${}^m\pi_t$ established in Lemma 6.2 also holds for the associated d-dimensional process ${}^mp_t = R^m\pi_t$.

We now extend the notions of reward and value function given in (3.7) to the process ${}^mp_t = R^m\pi_t$ with ${}^m\pi_t$ satisfying the regularized state equation (6.1). Since ${}^mp_t$ takes values in $\mathbb{R}^d$ and not only in $\mathcal{S}$ we extend the function b given in (3.2) with $(p,h)\in\mathcal{S}\times K \mapsto b(p,h)\in\mathbb{R}$ to $p = R\pi\in\mathbb{R}^d$. With the notation $b_* = \min\{b(p,h),\ p\in\mathcal{S}, h\in K\}$ and $b^* = \max\{b(p,h),\ p\in\mathcal{S}, h\in K\}$ we define

$$\widetilde{b}(p,h) := (b(p,h)\vee b_*)\wedge b^*.$$

Then $\widetilde{b}$ is bounded on $\mathbb{R}^d\times K$ and for $p\in\mathcal{S}$ the function $\widetilde{b}$ coincides with b. For the sake of simple notation in the sequel we simply write b instead of $\widetilde{b}$. We define the reward and value function associated to the regularized state equation (6.1) by

$$\begin{aligned}
v^m(t,\pi,h) &= E\Big(\exp\Big\{\int_t^T -b(R({}^m\pi_s^{(t,\pi,h)}),h_s)ds\Big\}\Big) \quad \text{for } h\in\mathcal{H},\\
V^m(t,\pi) &= \sup\{v^m(t,\pi,h)\colon h\in\mathcal{H}\}.
\end{aligned}$$

The reward and value function associated to the unregularized state equation (4.5) are denoted by $v(t,\pi,h)$ and $V(t,\pi)$. The generator associated to the solution of the regularized state equation (6.1) reads as

$$\begin{aligned}
{}^m\mathcal{L}^h g(\pi) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{d-1}\underline{\beta}_i^\top(\pi)\underline{\beta}_j(\pi)g_{\pi^i\pi^j} + \frac{1}{2m}\sum_{i=1}^{d-1}g_{\pi^i\pi^i} + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1}\underline{\alpha}^i(\pi,h)g_{\pi^i}\\
+\int_{\mathcal{U}}\{g(\pi+\underline{\gamma}(\pi,u)) - g(\pi)\}\nu(du)
\end{aligned}$$

and the associated dynamic programming equation is

$$V_t^m(t,\pi) + \sup_{h\in K}\Big\{ {}^m\mathcal{L}^h V^m(t,\pi) - b(R\pi, h;\theta)V^m(t,\pi)\Big\} = 0,\ (t,\pi)\in[0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^{d-1}.$$

Note, that for the generator ${}^m\mathcal{L}^h$ the *ellipticity condition* for the coefficients of the second derivatives holds: we have for all $z\in\mathbb{R}^{d-1}\setminus\{0\}$

$$z^\top(\underline{\beta}^\top\underline{\beta} + \frac{1}{2m}I_{d-1})z = z^\top\underline{\beta}^\top\underline{\beta}z + \frac{1}{2m}z^\top z = \ |\underline{\beta}z|^2\ + \frac{1}{2m}|z|^2 > 0.$$

Hence the results of Davis & Lleo (2011) yield the existence of a classical solution V^m. The optimal strategy ${}^m h^*$ of the regularized problem can be computed by a similar reasoning as Section 3. In particular, for K sufficiently large it follows that

$${}^m h^* = {}^m h^*(t,\pi) = \frac{1}{(1-\theta)}(\sigma\sigma^\top)^{-1}\Big\{MR\pi + \frac{1}{V^m(t,\pi)}\sigma\sum_{k=1}^{d-1}\underline{\beta}_k(\pi)V^m_{\pi^k}(t,\pi)\Big\} \tag{6.6}$$

$$\text{where}\quad \underline{\beta}_k(\pi) = \pi^k\sigma^{-1}\Big(\underline{\mu}_k - \sum_{j=1}^{d-1}\underline{\mu}_j\pi^j\Big) \quad\text{and}\quad \underline{\mu}_k := \mu_k-\mu_d,\ k=1,\dots,d-1.$$

Convergence of reward and value function. The next theorem on the uniform convergence of reward functions is our main result; convergence of the value function and ε-optimality of ${}^m h^*$ follow easily from this theorem.

Theorem 6.3 (Uniform Convergence of reward functions). *It holds*

$$\sup_{h\in\mathcal{H}}|v^m(t,\pi,h) - v(t,\pi,h)| \to 0 \quad \textit{for } m\to\infty,\quad t\in[0,T],\ \pi\in\underline{\mathcal{S}}.$$

Proof. We introduce the notation

$$J := \int_t^T -b(R\pi_s^{(t,\pi,h)}, h_s)ds \quad\text{and}\quad J^m := \int_t^T -b(R\,{}^m\pi_s^{(t,\pi,h)}, h_s)ds.$$

Then the reward functions read as $v(t,\pi,h) = E(e^J)$ and $v^m(t,\pi,h) = E(e^{J^m})$ and it holds

$$\begin{aligned} |v^m(t,\pi,h) - v(t,\pi,h)| &= |E(e^{J^m} - e^J)| \le E(|e^{J^m} - e^J|) \\ &\le CE(|J^m - J|), \end{aligned} \tag{6.7}$$

where we used Lipschitz continuity of $f(x) = e^x$ on bounded intervals and the boundedness of J and J^m which follows from the the boundedness of b. Using Lipschitz continuity of b we derive

$$\begin{aligned} E(|J^m - J|) &= E\Big(\Big|\int_t^T \big[b(R\pi_s^{(t,\pi,h)}, h_s) - b(R\,{}^m\pi_s^{(t,\pi,h)}, h_s)\big]ds\Big|\Big) \\ &\le \int_t^T C\,E(|{}^m\pi_s^{(t,\pi,h)} - \pi_s^{(t,\pi,h)}|)\,ds \\ &\le C\int_t^T \Big(E(|{}^m\pi_s^{(t,\pi,h)} - \pi_s^{(t,\pi,h)}|^2)\Big)^{1/2} ds \to 0 \end{aligned} \tag{6.8}$$

for $m\to\infty$ and uniformly w.r.t. $h\in\mathcal{H}$ which follows from Lemma 6.2. Plugging (6.8) into (6.7) we find

$$\sup_{h\in\mathcal{H}}|v^m(t,\pi,h) - v(t,\pi,h)| \to 0 \quad \text{for } m\to\infty. \qquad \square$$

Corollary 6.4 (Convergence of value functions). *It holds*

$$V^m(t,\pi) \to V(t,\pi) \quad \text{for } m \to \infty, \quad t \in [0,T],\ \pi \in \underline{\mathcal{S}}.$$

Proof. For $\theta \in (0,1)$ the assertion follows from

$$\begin{aligned} |V^m(t,\pi) - V(t,\pi)| &= \Big| \sup_{h\in\mathcal{H}} v^m(t,\pi,h) - \sup_{h\in\mathcal{H}} v(t,\pi,h) \Big| \\ &\le \sup_{h\in\mathcal{H}} |v^m(t,\pi,h) - v(t,\pi,h)| \end{aligned}$$

and Lemma 6.3. Analogously, for $\theta < 0$ it follows

$$\begin{aligned} |V^m(t,\pi) - V(t,\pi)| &= \Big| \inf_{h\in\mathcal{H}} v^m(t,\pi,h) - \inf_{h\in\mathcal{H}} v(t,\pi,h) \Big| \\ &= \Big| \sup_{h\in\mathcal{H}} (-v^m(t,\pi,h)) - \sup_{h\in\mathcal{H}} (-v(t,\pi,h)) \Big| \\ &\le \sup_{h\in\mathcal{H}} |v^m(t,\pi,h) - v(t,\pi,h)|. \end{aligned}$$

□

On ε-optimal stratgies. Finally we show that the optimal strategy ${}^m h^*$ for the regularized problem given in (6.6) is ε-optimal in the original problem. This gives a method for computing (nearly) optimal strategies.

Corollary 6.5 (ε-optimality). *For every $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists some $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$|V(t,\pi) - v(t,\pi,{}^m h^*)| \le \varepsilon \quad \text{for } m \ge m_0,$$

i.e. ${}^m h^*$ is an ε-optimal strategy for the original control problem.

Proof. It holds

$$\begin{aligned} |V(t,\pi) - v(t,\pi,{}^m h^*)| &\le |V(t,\pi) - v^m(t,\pi,{}^m h^*)| + |v^m(t,\pi,{}^m h^*) - v(t,\pi,{}^m h^*)| \\ &= |V(t,\pi) - V^m(t,\pi)| + |v^m(t,\pi,{}^m h^*) - v(t,\pi,{}^m h^*)| \quad (6.9) \end{aligned}$$

where for the first term on the r.h.s. we used $v^m(t,\pi,{}^m h^*) = V^m(t,\pi)$. Using the convergence properties for the reward function given in Lemma 6.3 and for the value function given in Corollary 6.4 we can find for every $\varepsilon > 0$ some $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $m \ge m_0$ it holds

$$|V(t,\pi) - V^m(t,\pi)| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad |v^m(t,\pi,{}^m h^*) - v(t,\pi,{}^m h^*)| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2}.$$

Plugging the above estimates into (6.9) it follows for $m \ge m_0$

$$|V(t,\pi) - v(t,\pi,{}^m h^*)| \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon.$$

□

Remark 6.6. Note that in the proof of the corollary we use that the sequence of reward functions v^m converges to v *uniformly* in h. This is a stronger property than convergence of the value functions V^m to V so that standard stability results for dynamic programming equations are not sufficient to proof the corollary.

References

Björk, T., Davis, M.H.A. and Landén, C. (2010): Optimal investment with partial information. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research* 71(2), 371-399.

Black, F., Litterman, R. (1992): Global portfolio optimization. *Financial Analysts Journal* 48(5), 28-43.

Bremaud, P. (1981) : *Point Processes and Queues: Martingale Dynamics*, Springer, New York.

Davis, M. and Lleo, S. (2012): Jump-Diffusion Risk-Sensitive Asset Management II: Jump-Diffusion Factor Model. arXiv:1102.5126v2 [q-fin.PM]

Elliott, R.J., Aggoun, L. and Moore, J.B. (1994): Hidden Markov Models, Springer, New York.

Fleming, W. H. and Soner, H. M. (2006): *Controlled Markov Processes and Viscosity Solutions*, 2nd edn, Springer, New York.

Frey, R., Gabih, A. and Wunderlich, R. (2012): Portfolio optimization under partial information with expert opinions. *International Journal of Theoretical and Applied Finance*, 15, No. 1.

Frey, R., Gabih, A. and Wunderlich, R. (2013): Viscosity solutions of dynamic programming equations for portfolio optimization under partial information with expert opinions. Working Paper

Jacod, J. & Shiryaev, A. (2003), *Limit Theorems for Stochastic Processes*, 2nd edn, Springer Verlag, Berlin.

Lakner, P. (1998): Optimal trading strategy for an investor: the case of partial information. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications* 76, 77-97.

Liptser, R.S. and Shiryaev A.N. (2001): *Statistics of Random Processes: General theory*, 2nd edn, Springer, New York.

Nagai, H. and Peng, S. (2002): Risk-sensitive dynamic portfolio optimization with partial information on infinite time horizon. *The Annals of Applied Probability* 12, 173-195.

Nagai, H. and Runggaldier, W.J. (2008): PDE approach to utility maximization for market models with hidden Markov factors. In: *Seminar on Stochastic Analysis, Random Fields and Applications V* (R.C.Dalang, M.Dozzi, F.Russo, eds.). Progress in Probability, Vol.59, Birkhäuser Verlag, 493-506.

Pham, H. (1998): Optimal Stopping of Controlled Jump Diffusion Processes: A viscosity Solution Approach. *Journal of Mathematical Systems, estimations, and Control* Vol.8, No.1, 1-27.

Oksendal, B., Sulem. A. (2005) : *Applied Stochastic Control of Jump Diffusions* , Springer, Berlin.

Rieder, U. and Bäuerle, N. (2005): Portfolio optimization with unobservable Markov-modulated drift process. *Journal of Applied Probability* 43, 362-378.

Rüschendorf, L. (2009): On the Distributional Transform, Sklars Theorem, and the Empirical Copula Process. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 139, 3921-3927.

Sass, J. and Haussmann, U.G (2004): Optimizing the terminal wealth under partial information: The drift process as a continuous time Markov chain. *Finance and Stochastics* 8, 553-577.

Sass, J. and Wunderlich, R. (2010): Optimal portfolio policies under bounded expected loss and partial information. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 72, 25-61.

Wonham, W.M. (1965): Some applications of stochastic differential equations to optimal non-linear filtering, *SIAM J.Control Opt.* , 347-369.

Appendix A. Proof of Lemma 5.4

We derive from differentiating $G_l(\widetilde{F}(z,p),p) = z_l$ w.r.t. p_j using the chain rule

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i} G_l(\widetilde{F}(z,p),p) \frac{\partial}{\partial p^j} \widetilde{F}_i(z,p) + \frac{\partial}{\partial p^j} G_l(\widetilde{F}(z,p),p) = 0.$$

Substituting $u = \widetilde{F}(z,p)$ we obtain the estimate

$$\Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial p^j} G_l(u,p)\Big| \le \sum_{i=1}^{\kappa} \Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial u_i} G_l(u,p)\Big|\Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial p^j}\widetilde{F}_i(z,p)\Big|. \tag{Appendix A.1}$$

(i) For the proof of the boundedness of the derivatives on the r.h.s. we need the following auxiliary estimates for the marginal densities $f_{Z_1 \dots Z_k}, k = 1, \dots, \kappa$ given in (5.2). From estimate (5.7) for $\overline{f}$ we derive the estimate

$$C_* \prod_{i=k+1}^{\kappa} (b_i - a_i) \le f_{Z_1 \dots Z_k}(z_1, \dots, z_k, p) \quad \le \quad C^* \prod_{i=k+1}^{\kappa} (b_i - a_i). \tag{Appendix A.2}$$

For the derivatives of the marginal densities w.r.t. p^j the definition of $\overline{f}$ in (2.7) yields

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p^j} f_{Z_1 \dots Z_k}(z_1, \dots, z_k, p) = \int_{a_{k+1}}^{b_{k+1}} \cdots \int_{a_\kappa}^{b_\kappa} f_j(z_1, \dots, z_k, s_{k+1}, \dots, s_\kappa) ds_{k+1} \dots ds_\kappa.$$

From Assumption 5.1 and (5.6) it follows

$$0 < C_1 \prod_{i=k+1}^{\kappa} (b_i - a_i) \le \frac{\partial}{\partial p^j} f_{Z_1 \dots Z_k}(z_1, \dots, z_k, p) \le C_2 \prod_{i=k+1}^{\kappa} (b_i - a_i) \tag{Appendix A.3}$$

For the derivatives of the marginal densities w.r.t. $z_j,\ j = 1 \dots, k$ we find

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} f_{Z_1 \dots Z_k}(z_1, \dots, z_k, p)\Big| \\
&\le \int_{a_{k+1}}^{b_{k+1}} \cdots \int_{a_\kappa}^{b_\kappa} \sum_{l=1}^{d} p^l \Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} f_l(z_1, \dots, z_k, s_{k+1}, \dots, s_\kappa)\Big| ds_{k+1} \dots ds_\kappa \\
&\le C_d \prod_{i=k+1}^{\kappa} (b_i - a_i),
\end{aligned} \tag{Appendix A.4}$$

where the upper bound from (5.6) on the derivatives of the densities f_j has been used.

(ii) Now we can prove the boundedness for the second term r.h.s. of (Appendix A.1). For $k = 2, \dots, \kappa$ we obtain from the definition of $\widetilde{F}(z,p)$ in (5.3)

$$\begin{aligned}
\Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial p^j}\widetilde{F}_i(z,p)\Big| &= \Big|\int_{a_k}^{z_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^j} f_{Z_k|Z_1 \dots Z_{k-1}}(s_k | z_1, \dots z_{k-1}, p) ds_k\Big| \\
&= \Big|\int_{a_k}^{z_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^j} \frac{f_{Z_1 \dots Z_k}(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}, s_k, p)}{f_{Z_1 \dots Z_{k-1}}(z_1, \dots, z_{k-1}, p)} ds_k\Big| \\
&\le \int_{a_k}^{z_k} \frac{1}{f^2_{Z_1 \dots Z_{k-1}}(\cdot)} \Big(\Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial p^j} f_{Z_1 \dots Z_k}(\cdot)\Big| f_{Z_1 \dots Z_{k-1}}(\cdot) + \\
&\qquad\qquad f_{Z_1 \dots Z_k}(.)\Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial p^j} f_{Z_1 \dots Z_{k-1}}(.)\Big| \Big) ds_k \le C.
\end{aligned}$$

Here, we have used estimate (Appendix A.2), which states that the marginal densities are bounded from above and bounded away from zero, and (Appendix A.3) for the boundedness of the derivatives of the marginal densities w.r.t. p^j.

For $k = 1$ we observe that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p^j}\widetilde{F}_1(z,p) = \frac{\partial}{\partial p^j} F_{Z_1}(z_1,p) = \int_{a_1}^{z_1} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^j} f_{Z_1}(s_1,p) ds_1.$$

The boundedness $\partial/\partial p^j \widetilde{F}_1(z,p)$ is a consequence of estimate (Appendix A.3).

(iii) For proving the boundedness of $\partial/\partial u_i G_l(u,p)$ in (Appendix A.1) we consider the Jacobian matrices for $G(u)$ and $\widetilde{F}(z)$ defined by

$$J^G(u) := \Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial u_j} G_i(u,p)\Big)_{i,j=1\dots,\kappa} \quad \text{and} \quad J^{\widetilde{F}}(z) := \Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} \widetilde{F}_i(z,p)\Big)_{i,j=1\dots,\kappa}.$$

Below we show that for $z = G(u,p)$ the matrix $J^{\widetilde{F}}(z)$ is regular, hence $J^G(u) = J_{\widetilde{F}}^{-1}(G(u,p))$, since $G(\widetilde{F}(z,p),p) = z$. From the definition of $\widetilde{F}$ in (5.3) it follows that $J^{\widetilde{F}}(z)$ is a lower triangular matrix since $\widetilde{F}_k$ depends on $z_1,\dots,z_k$ only.

Next we consider the diagonal elements of $J^{\widetilde{F}}(z)$. Using (Appendix A.2) we find constants $\underline{C}$ and $\overline{C}$ such that $\underline{C} \leq f_{Z_1\dots Z_k}(z_1,\dots,z_k,p) \leq \overline{C}$ for all $k = 1\dots,\kappa$. Then it holds with $\delta := \min\{\underline{C},\, \underline{C}\,/\,\overline{C}\}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{\partial}{\partial z_1}\widetilde{F}_1(z,p) = f_{Z_1}(z_1,p) \geq \delta \quad \text{and} \\
&\frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}\widetilde{F}_k(z,p) = f_{Z_k|Z_1\dots Z_{k-1}}(z_k|z_1,\dots z_{k-1},p) = \frac{f_{Z_1\dots Z_k}(z_1,\dots,z_k,p)}{f_{Z_1\dots Z_{k-1}}(z_1,\dots,z_{k-1},p)} \geq \delta,
\end{aligned}$$

for $k = 2,\dots,\kappa$. Since $J^{\widetilde{F}}(z)$ is triangular, its determinant is

$$\det(J^{\widetilde{F}}(z)) = \prod_{k=1}^{\kappa} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_k}\widetilde{F}_k(z,p) \geq \delta^\kappa > 0,$$

hence $J^{\widetilde{F}}(z)$ is invertible.

Next we show that the the non-zero off-diagonal elements of $J^{\widetilde{F}}$ are bounded. It holds for $k = 2,\dots,\kappa,\ j = 1,\dots,k-1$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j}\widetilde{F}_k(z,p) &= \int_{a_k}^{z_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} f_{Z_k|Z_1\dots Z_{k-1}}(s_k|z_1,\dots z_{k-1},p)\,ds_k \\
&= \int_{a_k}^{z_k} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} \frac{f_{Z_1\dots Z_k}(z_1,\dots,z_{k-1},s_k,p)}{f_{Z_1\dots Z_{k-1}}(z_1,\dots,z_{k-1},p)}\,ds_k \\
&\leq \int_{a_k}^{z_k} \frac{1}{f^2_{Z_1\dots Z_{k-1}}(\cdot)} \Big(\Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} f_{Z_1\dots Z_k}(\cdot)\Big| f_{Z_1\dots Z_{k-1}}(\cdot) \\
&\qquad\qquad + f_{Z_1\dots Z_k}(\cdot)\Big|\frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} f_{Z_1\dots Z_{k-1}}(\cdot)\Big| \Big)\,ds_k \leq C.
\end{aligned}$$

Here again we have used that the marginal densities are bounded from above and bounded away from zero, and (Appendix A.4) for the boundedness of the derivatives of the marginal densities w.r.t. z_j.

For proving the boundedness of $\partial/\partial u_i G_l(u,p)$ in (Appendix A.1) which are the entries of the Jacobian matrix $J^G(u)$ we use that J^G is the inverse of $J^{\widetilde{F}}$. Since $J^{\widetilde{F}}$ ist a triangular matrix the entries of J^G can be computed recursively by Gaussian elimination starting with the first row. This gives that for $k,l = 1,\dots,\kappa$

$$J^G_{kl} = \frac{1}{J^{\widetilde{F}}_{kk}}\Big(\delta_{kl} - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} J^{\widetilde{F}}_{kj}\, J^G_{jl}\Big),$$

i.e. the entry J^G_{kl} can be represented by an affine linear combination of the bounded off-diagonal entries in row k of $J^{\widetilde{F}}$ divided by $J^{\widetilde{F}}_{kk}$. The latter is strictly positive and bounded from below by $\delta > 0$. Hence, all entries of J^G are bounded.